

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

Fenster & Co.
12-01-2000
Docketed by: *ml*

PCT

To:
FENSTER, Maier
FENSTER & COMPANY PATENT
ATTORNEYS, LTD
P.O.Box 10256
Petach Tikva 49002
ISRAEL

RECEIVED
12-01-2000
FENSTER & Co.

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)		05.01.2000
Applicant's or agent's file reference 092/00810		REPLY DUE within 3 month(s) from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/IL99/00055	International filing date (day/month/year) 28/01/1999	Priority date (day/month/year) 30/01/1998
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F17/30		
Applicant EASYNET ACCESS INC. et al.		

1. This written opinion is the first drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Priority
 - ☒ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☒ Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Certain document cited
 - ☒ Certain defects in the international application
 - ☒ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also: For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed. the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 30/05/2000.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority: <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div> European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465 </div> </div>	Authorized officer / Examiner Glaser, N 8336 fax - 87426 <hr/> Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits) Taylor, K 2657 Telephone No. +49 89 2399 8856
---	--



WRITTEN OPINION

International application No. PCT/IL99/00055

I. Basis of the opinion

1. This opinion has been drawn on the basis of (*substitute sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed".*):

Description, pages:

1-20 as originally filed

Claims, No.:

1-85 as originally filed

Drawings, sheets:

1-2 as originally filed

2. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
- ☐ the claims, Nos.:
- ☐ the drawings, sheets:

3. This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)):

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been and will not be examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
- ☒ claims Nos. 2-85,

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 1-40 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):
see separate sheet
- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☒ no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos. 41-85.

IV. Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation (Form PCT/IPEA/405) to restrict or pay additional fees, the applicant has:

- ☐ restricted the claims.
- ☐ paid additional fees.
- ☐ paid additional fees under protest.
- ☒ neither restricted nor paid additional fees.

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with for the following reasons and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees:

3. Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary examination in establishing this opinion:

- ☐ all parts.
- ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-40.

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	1 (no)
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1 (no)
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1 (yes)

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

VII. Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

The examination is being carried out on the application documents as **originally filed**.

Reference is made to the following prior art documents (D) :

- D1: TAKADA T: 'Multilingual information exchange through the World-Wide Web'
COMPUTER NETWORKS AND ISDN SYSTEMS, vol. 27, no. 2, 1 November
1994 (1994-11-01), page 235-241
- D2: HAHN M: 'UNIFORM RESOURCE LOCATORS' EDPACS, vol. 23, no. 6, 1
December 1995 (1995-12-01), pages 8-13

Section III (No opinion)

1. In view of the lack of conciseness and the lack of clarity, it is not at present practicable to carry out a full examination of the application. The examination of **claims 2-40 is postponed** until these objections are overcome.
2. The applicant is therefore requested to file suitable amendments upon which the further prosecution of the application is to be based, and to state clearly the difference of the claimed invention to the prior art documents D1 and D2.

Section IV (Lack of unity)

- 1.1 A total of **six different inventions** has been found which are not linked to form a single general inventive concept. Therefore the claimed invention lacks unity (Art. 13 PCT). The list of the different inventions is given in the search report.
- 1.2 A partial search report has been established for claims 1-40. Therefore, examination is performed for **claims 1-40** only.

Section V (Novelty, Inventive Step)

1. Document **D1** discloses a method of WWW page retrieval from a website comprising

the features recited in **claim 1**. The applicant is referred to Figures 1 and 3 where a list box is illustrated for entering information and said information being in a non-Latin language. The subject matter of **claim 1** as presently formulated is therefore not novel over D1 in the sense of Art. 33(2) PCT.

2. Document D2 is relevant for the analysis of information associated with a website. This type of information is denominated in D2 as URL and different techniques are disclosed of how to analyse and interpret this information.

Section VII-VIII (Deficiencies in Form, Content, Clarity)

- 1.1 The independent method **claims 1, 2, 3 and 4** lack conciseness (Art. 6 PCT) and there appears to be no justification for more than one independent claim in this category (Rule 13.4 PCT).
- 1.2 Having regard to the independent method **claims 1-4**, it is not clear what should be considered as the essential features of the claimed invention. All claims differ substantially from one another with respect to a third step of the claimed method, i.e. "non-Latin information" (claim 1), "displaying comprising analysing .." (claim 2), "information being entered into a URL field" (claim 3), "page is selected responsive to a geographical location" (claim 4).
- 1.3 The independent **claims 5-40** put an undue burden on the examiner for determining the subject matter of the claims. According to Rule 6.3(c) and PCT/GL/C-III-3.6, all dependent claims should be grouped together to the extent and in the most practicable way possible. The current set of dependent claims creates obscurity in the definition of the subject matter to be protected.
2. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT). The claims should be adapted accordingly.
3. The references to the prior art documents on **pages 3** (Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT) are ambiguous. It is noted that the reference to prior art documents should be such that these documents are clearly identified (PCT/GL/C-II 4.17 and 4.6) and not

misleading. Consequently, a clear reference to those documents should be given.

Other matters

1. In order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Art. 34(2) PCT, the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, no matter whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based (see also Rule 66.8(a) PCT).
2. If the applicant regards it as appropriate these indications could be submitted in handwritten form on a copy of the relevant parts of the applicant as filed. The applicant is requested to file amendments by way of replacement pages in the manner stipulated by Rule 66.8(a) PCT. Fair copies of the amendments should be filed in triplicate.
3. Moreover, the applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that, as a consequence of Rule 66.8(a) PCT the examiner is not permitted to carry out any amendments under the PCT procedure, however minor these may be.



EPA/EPO/OEB
D-80298 München
☎ +49 89 2399-0
TX 523 656 epmu d
FAX +49 89 2399-4465

Europäisches
Patentamt

Generaldirektion 2

European
Patent Office

Directorate General 2

Office européen
des brevets

Direction Générale 2

Correspondence with the EPO on PCT Chapter II demands

In order to ensure that your PCT Chapter II demand is dealt with as promptly as possible you are requested to use the enclosed self-adhesive labels with any correspondence relating to the demand sent to the Munich Office.

One of these labels should be affixed to a prominent place in the upper part of the letter or form etc. which you are filing.